

In the Drawings

Applicant submits herein Amended Drawings of Figures 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 9 and 10.

5

Applicants Response to Examiner's Comments

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant submits enclosed herein an information disclosure form (PTO/SB/8a) listing both references noted in the specification of the application and additional prior art patents.

Drawings

Examiner objects to several drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to label (a.) boxes (4, 10-12,20,40) in Figure 1; (b.) boxes (4A to 4G) in Figure 2; (c.) boxes (24-34) in Figure 4; (d.) boxes (44-70) in Figure 7; (e.) boxes 74-84 in Figure 9; and (f.) boxes (4, 76 & 78) in Figure 10 and as described in the specification. Examiner notes that any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in a drawing. Applicant respectfully submits that Figures 1, 2, 4 and 7 as currently amended herein include labeled boxes and fully comply with 37 CFR 1.83(a)

Examiner further objects to the drawings as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) as not including the reference sign 22 for an Internet 22 and as mentioned in the detailed description on page 34. Applicant replies that Figures 1 and 3 as currently amended herein include the reference sign 22 and the element of the Internet 22.

In reference to Figure 8, Examiner objects to drawings because is not in a flow chart layout. Applicant further replies that Figure 8 as currently amended herein is in flow chart layout.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Amended Figures 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 9 and 10 as enclosed and submitted herein address Examiner's objections and are fully in compliance with MPEP 608/02(d), 37 CFR 1.83(a) and 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5).

Applicant acknowledges that corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121 (d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application, and attests that all amended replacement drawing sheets include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet.

Claim Objections

Examiner objects to Claim 34 for including an acronym "EPC" that is not defined in the claim. Applicant respectfully replies that Claim 34 as currently amended has replaced the language

of Claim 34 as originally filed of “a record of an EPC” with more clarifying language of “an Electronic Product Code”.

Applicant therefore respectfully submits that Claim 34 as currently amended satisfies Examiner’s objection and is therefore allowable.

5 Examiner objects to Claim 35 for including a record of an Electronic Product Code that is also presented in Claim 34. Applicant respectfully replies that Claim 35 as originally filed is now distinguished from Claim 34 as currently amended as Claim 35 teaches of an Electronic Product Code contained within “a record of an Electronic Product Code”, whereas Claim 34 as currently amended does not include the limitation of the Electronic Product Code being comprised within a
10 record.

Applicant therefore respectfully submits that, due to the current amendment of Claim 34, Claim 35 as originally filed satisfies Examiner’s objection and is therefore allowable.

Applicant therefore respectfully submits that Examiner’s objections to Claims 34-35 have been fully and satisfied addressed by the currently amended Claims 24-26 as submitted herein.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

15 Examiner rejects Claim 9 under 35 U.S.C second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

20 Examiner states that in Claim 9, the phrase "wherein the message is at least partially formatted in mathematical relationship to at least one of the plurality of authorization key" is confusing and unclear. Examiner holds that it is not understood what is meant by such a limitation. Examiner notes that Claim 9 depends on Claim 1 and states that the message is NOT formatted at least partially in mathematical relationship to the first authorization key. Examiner asks if the message is at least partially formatted in mathematical relationship to at least one of
25 the plurality of authorization key.

Applicant submits replies that the language quoted above has been deleted from Claim 9 as currently amended and that Claim 9 as currently amended is therefore allowable.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

30 Examiner rejects Claims 1, 3, 31 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yap et al. (US# 6,111,506) in view of Hopkins (US# 5,757,918) and Olah (US# 5,396,218).

Examiner rejects Claims 1,3,31 and 33 are under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yap et al. (US# 6,111,506) in view of Hopkins (US# 5,757,918) and Olah (US# 5,396,218).

In reference to Claim 1, Examiner states that Yap et al. disclose a system (60) (i.e. an improved security system) for providing a secure document (10) (i.e. a security identification document) (column 3 lines 66 to column 4 line 24; see Figure 7), the system (60) including:

a computer network (62) including a computer(64) and an RFID transponder (i.e. integrated circuit IC) (see Figure 7), the computer (64) having a database (i.e. memory), and the database containing a first authorization key (i.e. biometric data) (column 14 lines 52 to column 15 line 29);

the secure document (10), the secure document including an integrated RFID circuit (14-18) (i.e. an integrated circuit IC) coupled with a flexible substrate (12) (column 12 lines 30 to 39; see Figure 1);

the flexible substrate (12) having a surface, the surface visibly presenting an information (column 14 lines 13 to 21);

the integrated RFID circuit (14-18) (i.e. an integrated circuit IC) coupled with the substrate (12), and the integrated RFID circuit (14-18) having a durable memory, a controller (14) (column 12 lines 36 to 46);

the durable memory (i.e. embedded in microcontroller 14) including an information storage sector, the information storage sector having a record of at least a portion of the information (column 5 lines 53 to 63; column 15 lines 31 to 37);

the controller (14) coupled with the durable memory, and the controller (14) for enabling access to the durable memory by the RFID transponder (column ~3 lines 27 to 38; column 16 lines 1 to 11);

Examiner notes that Yap et al. did not explicitly disclose either (a.) the memory that includes a protected sector having at least one datum not recorded within the information of the flexible substrate; or (b.) a data security circuit for denying authority to the controller to execute instructions received in a message, where the message is not formatted at least partially in mathematical relationship to the first authorization key.

Examiner states that in the same field of endeavor of a security device authentication in a

smart card, Hopkins teaches that a memory (31) includes the protected sector (i.e. a encrypted format section of data) having at least one datum (Le. a secret value) not recorded within the information of the flexible substrate (12) (column 2 lines 62 to 65; column 5 lines 2 to 7) in order to avoid duplication to the smart card's identification values.

5 Examiner holds that at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to recognize the need to have a memory with a secret key taught by Hopkins et al. in a security feature of the microprocessor of Yap et al. because having a secret key would increase security of reading the data in the memory and to protect the transaction verification and authentication system.

10 Examiner states that in the same field of endeavor of a portable security system, Olah teaches that a data security circuit (22) (i.e. a comparator) for denying authority to the controller (30) to execute instructions received in a message, where the message is not formatted at least partially in mathematical relationship to the first authorization key (i.e. id code) (column 3 lines 41 to 50; column 4 lines 7 to 13; see Figures 1 and 2) in order to start carrier signal generator.

15 Examiner holds that at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to recognize using a comparator in a portable card taught by Olah et al. in a security feature of the microprocessor of Yap et al. in view of Hopkins because having a comparator to compare for a match identification before start carrier signal generator would increase security of a transaction between portable units.

20 Applicant first notes that Examiner has made the following statement regarding allowable subject matter in the Office Action of May 17, 2006:

“the prior art fail to suggest limitations wherein different authorization keys are provided to different parties to form a hierarchy of access to various sectors of protected information.”

25 Applicant respectfully replies that Claim 1 as currently amended includes the limitation as follows:

“wherein different authorization keys are provided to different parties to form a hierarchy of access to various portions of the information stored within the durable memory.”

Applicant respectfully submits that the scope of Claim 1 as currently amended includes,

and is limited to, allowable subject matter and teaches that different authorization keys are provided to different parties to form a hierarchy of access to various sectors of protected information.

5 In reference to Claim 3, Examiner states that Yap et al. in view of Hopkins and Olah disclose the system of Claim 1, Yap et al. disclose wherein the first authorization key (i.e. biometric data) is at least partially computed on the basis of biometric data (column 15 lines 53 to 65).

Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 3 depends directly from independent Claim 1 as currently amended and is therefore allowable.

10 In reference to Claims 31 and 33, Examiner states that Yap et al. in view of Hopkins and Olah disclose a method and the system for providing a secure document, to the extent as claimed with respect to Claim 1 above, and Hopkins disclose the device further including: at least two different authorization keys (Le. one is public identification of the user and the other is a secret key) (column 2 lines 52 to 67).

15 Applicant first respectfully notes that Claim 31 is cancelled without prejudice in the interest of expeditious prosecution of the instant patent application.

Applicant respectfully replies that Claim 33 as currently amended includes the limitation as follows:

20 “wherein different authorization keys are provided to different parties to form a hierarchy of access to various sectors of protected information.”

Applicant respectfully submits that the scope of Claim 33 as currently amended includes, and is limited to, allowable subject matter and teaches that different authorization keys are provided to different parties to form a hierarchy of access to various sectors of protected information.

25 In reference to Claims 20-21, Examiner states that Yap et al. in view of Hopkins and Olah disclose the system of Claim 1. Examiner notes that Yap et al. in view of Hopkins and Olah did not explicitly disclose wherein the first authorization key that includes a checksum, the checksum computed upon the basis of at least a portion of the information printed on said

document.

Examiner states that In the same field of endeavor of a portable security system, Want et al. teach that wherein the first authorization key that includes a checksum, the checksum computed upon the basis of at least a portion of the information printed on said document
5 (column 11 lines 45 to 50) in order to increase security and error checking scheme.

Examiner holds that at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that using a unique ID code and a checksum taught by Want et al. in an improved security identification document system of Yap et al. in view of Hopkins and Olah because using an ID code with a checksum would increase security in a
10 selected RFID tags.

Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 20 depends directly from independent Claim 1 as currently amended and is is therefore allowable.

Applicant further respectfully submits that Claim 21 depends directly from Claim 20 and is therefore allowable.

15 Examiner rejects Claims 2, 10-14 and 16-17 under 35 U.S.C. 1 03 (a) as being unpatentable over Yap et al. (US# 6,111,506) in view of Hopkins (US# 5,757,918) and Olah (US# 5,396,218) as applied to Claim 1 and in further view of Brady et al. (US# 6, 1 00,804).

In reference to Claim 2, Examiner states that Yap et al. in view of Hopkins and Olah disclose the system of Claim 1. Examiner notes that Yap et al. in view of Hopkins and Olah did
20 not explicitly disclose the system further comprising a printer, the printer communicatively coupled with the computer and the printer for adding visible information to the surface of the flexible substrate.

Examiner states that the same field of endeavor of a portable security system, Brady et al. teach that the system includes a printer (1600), the printer (1600) communicatively coupled with
25 the computer and the printer (1600) for adding visible information to the surface of the flexible substrate (1604) (i.e. a label stock) (column 15 lines 11 to 36; see Figures 16-18) in order to print designated information on a selected RFID tags associated with a selected label.

Examiner holds that at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to recognize using a printer connect to a computer network to print

information on a selected RFID tag associated with a selected label taught by Brady et al. in an improved security identification document system of Yap et al. in view of Hopkins and Olah because using a printer to write information on a selected label would be a convenient way for indicating label.

5 Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 2 depends directly from independent Claim 1 as currently amended and is therefore allowable.

 In reference to Claims 10-11, Yap et al. in view of Hopkins and Olah disclose a secure document system as claimed in Claim 1, the Claims 10-11 differs from Claim 1 in that the Claims 10-11 requires the limitation of Claim 2 already addressed above and Brady et al.
10 disclose all the limitation to the extent as claimed with respect to Claim 2 above and therefore Claims 10-11 are also rejected as being obvious for the same reasons given with respect to Claim 2.

 Applicant respectfully replies that Claim 10 as currently amended includes the limitation as follows:

15 “wherein different authorization keys are provided to different parties to form a hierarchy of access to various sectors of protected information.”

 Applicant respectfully submits that the scope of Claim 10 as currently amended includes, and is limited to, allowable subject matter and teaches that different authorization keys are provided to different parties to form a hierarchy of access to various sectors of protected
20 information.

 Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 11 depends directly from independent Claim 10 as currently amended and is therefore allowable.

 In reference to Claim 12, Examiner states that Yap et al. in view of Hopkins, Olah and Brady et al. disclose a secure document system as claimed in Claim 10, Yap et al. disclose
25 wherein the digital data includes a unique identification number (column 2 lines 52 to 67).

 Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 12 depends directly from independent Claim 10 as currently amended and is therefore allowable.

 In reference to Claim 13, Examiner states that Yap et al. in view of Hopkins, Olah and

Brady et al. disclose a secure document system as claimed in Claim 10, Yap et al. disclose wherein the digital data includes a portion of the information (Le. a secret value of data) that is printed on the flexible substrate (column 5 lines 1 to 9).

Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 13 depends directly from independent Claim 10 as currently amended and is therefore allowable.

In reference to Claim 14, Examiner states that Yap et al. in view of Hopkins, Olah and Brady et al. disclose a secure document system as claimed in Claim 10, Yap et al. disclose wherein the device (12) is a form of currency document or other monetary instrument (i.e. bank card) (column 4 lines 15 to 23).

Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 14 depends directly from independent Claim 10 as currently amended and is therefore allowable.

In reference to Claim 16, Examiner states that Yap et al. in view of Hopkins, Olah and Brady et al. disclose a secure document system as claimed in Claim 10, Yap et al. disclose wherein the device (10) is an airline ticket (column 16 lines 31 to 38; see Figure 8).

Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 16 depends directly from independent Claim 10 as currently amended and is therefore allowable.

In reference to Claim 17, Examiner states that Yap et al. in view of Hopkins, Olah and Brady et al. disclose a secure document system as claimed in Claim 10, Yap et al. disclose wherein the durable memory also includes other information about the ticket such as destination and flight number (column 16 lines 47 to 52).

Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 17 depends directly from independent Claim 10 as currently amended and is therefore allowable.

Examiner rejects Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yap et al. (US# 6,111,506) in view of Hopkins (US# 5,757,918), Olah (US# 5,396,218) as applied to Claim 1 and in further view of Valencia et al. (US# 5,380,991).

In reference to Claim 4, Examiner states that Yap et al. in view of Hopkins and Olah disclose the system of Claim 1. Examiner notes that Yap et al. in view of Hopkins and Olah did not explicitly disclose wherein the message is a revocation of a validity state of the secure document.

Examiner states that in the same field of endeavor of a portable security system, Valencia et al. teach that a coupon (2) (i.e. a customer card) send expiration data of the coupon (column 5 lines 8 to 17; see Figures 1-2) in order to indicate and associate with a validation state of a coupon.

5 Examiner holds that at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to recognize using a customer card with an integrated circuit memory with an expiration data taught by Valencia et al. in an improved security identification document system of Yap et al. in view of Hopkins and Olah because using a customer card as a coupon with an expiration data would be a convenient way for properly reimburse by each individual
10 retailer.

Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 4 depends directly from independent Claim 1 as currently amended and is therefore allowable.

Examiner rejects Claims 18-19 and 27-30 are under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yap et al. (US# 6,111,506) in view of Hopkins (US# 5,757,918), Olah (US#
15 5,396,218) and Brady et al. (US# 6,100,804) as applied to Claims 1, 2 and 10 and in further view of Valencia et al. (US# 5,380,991).

In reference to Claims 18-19 and 27-30, Examiner states that Yap et al. in view of Hopkins, Olah and Brady et al. disclose the system of Claims 2 and 10.

Examiner notes that Yap et al. in view of Hopkins, Olah and Brady et al. did not
20 explicitly disclose the system wherein the device is a coupon and where the durable memory also includes additional information about the coupon such as the redemption value of the coupon.

Examiner states that in the same field of endeavor of a portable security system, Valencia et al. teach that a coupon (2) (i.e. a customer card) and where the durable memory (6) (i.e. EEPROM) also includes additional information about the coupon such as the redemption value
25 (i.e. discount amount) of the coupon (column 5 lines 8 to 21; see Figures 1-2) in order to have a paperless coupon redemption system.

Examiner holds that at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to recognize using a customer card with an integrated circuit memory with a redemption value taught by Valencia et al. in an improved security identification

document system of Yap et al. in view of Hopkins and Olah because using a customer card as a coupon with a redemption value would be a convenient way for properly reimburse by each individual retailer.

Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 18 depends directly from independent Claim 1 as currently amended and is therefore allowable. Applicant further respectfully submits that Claim 19 depends directly from Claim 18 as currently amended and is therefore allowable.

Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 27 depends from intervening Claim 2 and independent Claim 1 as currently amended and is therefore allowable. Applicant further respectfully submits that Claims 28-30 each depend directly from Claim 27 and are therefore allowable.

Examiner rejects Claims 5-8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yap et al. (US# 6,111,506) in view of Hopkins (US# 5,757,918) and Olah (US# 5,396,218) as applied to Claims 1 and 10 and in further view of Fell et al. (US 2003/0137145).

In reference to Claims 5-7, Examiner states that Yap et al. in view of Hopkins and Olah disclose the system of Claim 1.

Examiner notes that Yap et al. in view of Hopkins and Olah did not explicitly disclose wherein the secure document is a payroll check, certified check or a cashier check.

Examiner states that in the same field of endeavor of an article security system, Fell et al. teach that a secure document is a check or official document (page 1 paragraph 0015; see Figure 1 to 6) in order to create a convenient daily use for security document.

Examiner holds that at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to recognize using a security device in a check or currency note taught by Fell et al. in an improved security identification document system of Yap et al. in view of Hopkins and Olah because using a security device in a check or official document would easily authenticate a check.

Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 5-7 depend directly from independent Claim 1 as currently amended and are therefore allowable.

In reference to Claim 8, Examiner states that Yap et al. in view of Hopkins and Olah disclose the system of Claim 1, and that Fell et al. disclose wherein the secure document is a

currency note (page 1 paragraph 0015).

Applicant further respectfully submits that Claim 8 directly from independent Claim 1 as currently amended and is therefore allowable.

5 Examiner rejects Claims 15 and 22-26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yap et al. (US# 6,111,506) in view of Hopkins (US# 5,757,918), Olah (US# 5,396,218) and Brady et al. (US# 6,100,804) as applied to Claims 2 and 10 and in further view of Fell et al. (US 2003/0137145).

10 In reference to Claims 15 and 22, Examiner states that Yap et al. in view of Hopkins, Olah and Brady et al. disclose the system as claimed in Claim 10, and that Claim 15 is also rejected for the same obvious reasons given with respect to Claim 8.

Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 15 depends directly from independent Claim 10 as currently amended and is therefore allowable.

Applicant further respectfully submits that Claim 22 depends from intervening Claim 2 and independent Claim 1 as currently amended and is therefore allowable.

15 In reference to Claims 23-26, Examiner states that Yap et al. in view of Hopkins, Olah and Brady et al. disclose the system as claimed in Claim 2, the Claims 23-26 same in that the Claim 16-17 already addressed above therefore Claim 23-26 are also rejected for the same obvious reasons given with respect to Claims 16-17.

20 Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 23-26 depend from intervening Claim 2 and independent Claim 1 as currently amended and are therefore allowable.

Examiner rejects Claims 34-35 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yap et al. (US# 6,111,506) in view of Hopkins (US# 5,757,918) and Olah (US# 5,396,218) as applied to Claim 1 and in further view of Lindsay et al. (US# 6,982,640).

25 In reference to Claims 34-35, Examiner states that Yap et al. in view of Hopkins and Olah disclose the system of Claim 1. Examiner notes that Yap et al. in view of Hopkins and Olah did not explicitly disclose wherein the durable memory further comprises a record of an EPC or an Electronic Product Code.

Examiner states that in the same field of endeavor of a RFID security system, Lindsay et al. teach that durable memory further comprises a record of an EPC or an Electronic Product

Code (column 7 lines 11 to 19) in order to use to store a unique code on each tag.

Examiner holds that at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to recognize using an memory to record an electronic product code of an RFID tag taught by Lindsay et al. in an improved security identification document system of Yap et al. in view of Hopkins and Olah because using the memory to store an electronic product code would be easily accessible in associating product information in a database.

Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 34-35 each depend directly from independent Claim 1 as currently amended and are therefore allowable.

New Claim 36

The new Claim 36 teaches of a comparison of a biometric information (see paragraphs 0070, 0094 and 0098) stored in a durable memory (see element 4C, FIG 2; element 58, FIG. 7; and paragraphs 0016, 0026, 0030, 0068, 0070, 0095 and 0096) of an RFID tag 4 (see element 4, Figures 1, 2, 9 & 10; and paragraphs 0060 and 0068) that is authenticated by means of comparison with remotely stored information (see paragraphs 0018, 0030 and 0040) recorded in a remote database (see element 12, FIG. 1; and paragraphs 0030, 0036, 0040, 0070; 0071, 0079 and 0087). The elements and claimed relatedness of the elements of the new Claim 36 are thereby supported by the Specification and Figures as originally filed.

Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 36 is directly from independent Claim 32 as currently amended and is allowable.

Allowable Subject Matter

Examiner would allow Claim 32, if Claim 32 is rewritten to include all of the limitations of the independent Claim 31 from which Claim 32 as originally filed directly depends.

Examiner states in reference to Claim 32 the following reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

“the prior art fail to suggest limitations wherein different authorization keys are provided to different parties to form a hierarchy of access to various sectors of protected information.”

Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 32 as currently amended herein is rewritten in independent form and includes all limitations of the base independent Claim 31 from which Claim 32 previously directly depended. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that Claim 32

as currently amended is allowable.

Applicant acknowledges that any comments regarding reasons for allowance considered necessary by Applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance".

In summation, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's objections to the Claims have been fully resolved by the Claims as currently amended. Applicant further respectfully submits that the Examiner's rejections of the Claims have been fully traversed by scope and recitations of the Claims as currently amended, and that the Claims are therefore allowable.

If any matters can be resolved by telephone, Applicant requests that the Patent and Trademark Office call the Applicant at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Patrick T. Reilly
Reg. No. 37,427

Patrick Reilly
Patent Attorney
Box 7218
Santa Cruz, CA 95061-7218
(831) 332-7127